



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/995,151	11/27/2001	Steven L. Rohall	LOT9-2001-0008	9916

21127 7590 05/23/2005

KUDIRKA & JOBSE, LLP  
ONE STATE STREET  
SUITE 800  
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

WINTER, JOHN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/995,151

Applicant(s)

ROHALL ET AL.

Examiner

John M Winter

Art Unit

3621

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --****Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 8,9 and 17 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10-16 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 19 and 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 3621

## DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1- 20 remain pending.

### *Response to Arguments*

The applicants arguments filed on March 5, 2005 have been fully considered.

The Examiner states that claims 18 is rejected in view of the newly discovered reference to Srivastava et al (US Patent 6,374,292).

The Applicant states that the claims of the present invention are directed towards a different purpose and are not obvious in view of the prior art.

Examiner responds that as per *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972 (Bd Pat App & Int) "To support conclusion that claimed combination is directed to obvious subject matter, the references must either expressly or impliedly suggest claimed combination or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why artisan would have found claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the references teachings.", the Examiner states the reference deals with the generalized problem of organizing and storing electronic data and therefore would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 7, and 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gay, (US Patent 6,792,145) in view of Rackman (US Patent No 5,903,646).

As per claim 1,

Gay ('145) discloses in a computer system operatively coupled to a network and capable of executing a communication process for sending and receiving electronic mail documents, a method comprising:

storing the shadow document in a computer usable memory.(Figure 2 [download new financial document])

Gay ('145) does not explicitly disclose creating a shadow document from an original document; identifying one of a parent and child document of the original document and storing a reference thereto in the shadow document. Rackman ('646) discloses creating a shadow document from an original document;(Column 8, lines 15-17; figure 4A[ steps 32-36, generating

Art Unit: 3621

the redacted image]) identifying one of a parent and child document of the original document and storing a reference thereto in the shadow document,(Column 8, lines 47-52[a list of links is maintained]). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Gay ('145) method with the Rackman ('646) in order to create a redundant data archive so that the document could be retrieved in the event of primary system failing.

As per claim 2,

Gay ('145) discloses the method of claim 1 wherein "A" further comprises: parsing the original document for selected of the logistical data.(Figure 2)

As per claim 3,

Gay ('145) discloses the method of claim 2

Official Notice is taken that "the logistical data comprises any of sender, receiver, original size, subject, date, carbon copies of the original document" is common and well known in prior art in reference to document analysis. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize logistical data comprising information about the sender, receiver, subject etc.. in order to create a profile of the documents usage.

As per claim 4,

Gay ('145) discloses the method of claim 1 wherein "A" further comprises: filtering the original document for selected content.(Figure 2)

As per claim 5,

Gay ('145) discloses the method of claim 2

Gay ('145) does not explicitly disclose wherein the shadow document further comprises selected data from the content of the original document. Rackman ('646) discloses wherein the shadow document further comprises selected data from the content of the original document. (Figure 4A). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Gay ('145) method with the Rackman ('646) in order to create a redundant data archive using the original content so that the document could be retrieved in the event of primary system failing.

As per claim 6,

Gay ('145) discloses the method of claim 1

Official Notice is taken that "the shadow document is created upon transmission of an original document to the communication process" is common and well known in prior art in reference to document analysis. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create a copy of a document upon transmission in order to create a redundant data archive using the original content so that the document could be retrieved in the event of primary system failing. The Examiner notes that this feature is common so mail systems such as Microsoft Outlook.

As per claim 7,

Art Unit: 3621

Gay ('145) discloses the method of claim 1

Official Notice is taken that "the shadow document is created upon sending of an original document to the communication process" is common and well known in prior art in reference to document analysis. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create a copy of a document upon transmission in order to create a redundant data archive using the original content so that the document could be retrieved in the event of primary system failing. The Examiner notes that this feature is common so mail systems such as Microsoft Outlook.

As per claim 10,

Gay ('145) discloses a computer program product for use with a computer system operatively coupled to a network and capable of executing a communication process for sending and receiving electronic mail documents, the computer program product comprising a computer useable medium having embodied therein program code comprising:

program code for storing the shadow document in memory.(Figure 2 [download new financial document])

Gay ('145) does not explicitly disclose program code for creating a shadow document from an original document; program code for identifying one of a parent and child document of the original document. Rackman ('646) discloses program code for creating a shadow document from an original document;(Column 8, lines 15-17; figure 4A) program code for identifying one of a parent and child document of the original document (Column 8, lines 47-52[a list of links is maintained]). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Gay ('145) method with the Rackman ('646) in order to create a redundant data archive so that the document could be retrieved in the event of primary system failing.

As per claim 11,

Gay ('145) discloses a computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave for use with a computer system operatively coupled to a network and capable of executing a communication process for sending and receiving electronic mail documents, the computer data signal comprising:

program code for storing the shadow document in memory.(Figure 2 [download new financial document])

Gay ('145) does not explicitly disclose program code for creating a shadow document from an original document; program code for identifying one of a parent and child document of the original document. Rackman ('646) discloses program code for creating a shadow document from an original document;(Column 8, lines 15-17; figure 4A [ steps 32-36, generating the redacted image]) program code for identifying one of a parent and child document of the original document (Column 8, lines 47-52 [a list of links is maintained]). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Gay ('145) method with the Rackman ('646) in order to create a redundant data archive so that the document could be retrieved in the event of primary system failing.

As per claim 12,

Art Unit: 3621

Gay ('145) discloses an apparatus for use with a computer system operatively coupled to a network and capable of executing a communication process for sending and receiving electronic mail documents, the apparatus comprising:

program logic for storing the shadow document in memory. (Figure 2)

Gay ('145) does not explicitly disclose program logic for creating a shadow document from an original document, program logic for identifying one of a parent and child document of the original document. Rackman ('646) discloses program logic for creating a shadow document from an original document, (Column 8, lines 15-17; figure 4A [ steps 32-36, generating the redacted image]) program logic for identifying one of a parent and child document of the original document. (Column 8, lines 47-52 [a list of links is maintained]). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Gay ('145) method with the Rackman ('646) in order to create a redundant data archive so that the document could be retrieved in the event of primary system failing.

As per claim 13,

Gay ('145) discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising:

presenting graphical representations of a plurality of documents in a manner which indicates relationships among the documents. (Figure 5)

As per claim 14,

Gay ('145) discloses the method of claim 13

wherein at least one of the plurality of presented documents is an original document. (Figure 5)

As per claim 15,

Gay ('145) discloses the method of claim 13

wherein at least one of the plurality of presented documents is a shadow document. (Figure 5)

As per claim 16,

Gay ('145) discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising:

resolving the reference in a shadow document to one of the parent and child document, and maintaining in memory data identifying a plurality of shadow documents and any parent and child documents thereof. (Figure 2)

Claims 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gay, (US Patent 6,792,145) in view of Rackman (US Patent No 5,903,646) and further in view of Srivastava et al (US Patent 6,374,292)

As per claim 18,

Gay ('145) discloses in a computer system operatively coupled to a network and capable of executing a communication process for sending and receiving electronic mail documents, a method comprising:

storing the shadow document in memory. (Figure 2 [download new financial document])

Art Unit: 3621

Gay ('145) does not explicitly disclose creating a shadow document from an original document upon sending of the original document by the communication process, identifying one of a parent and child document of the sent original document and storing a reference thereto in the shadow document. Rackman ('646) discloses creating a shadow document from an original document upon sending of the original document by the communication process, (Column 8, lines 15-17; figure 4A[ steps 32-36, generating the redacted image]) identifying one of a parent and child document of the sent original document and storing a reference thereto in the shadow document; (Column 8, lines 47-52[a list of links is maintained]). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Gay ('145) method with the Rackman ('646) in order to create a redundant data archive so that the document could be retrieved in the event of primary system failing.

Gay ('145) does not explicitly disclose wherein identifying one of a parent and child document of the received original document and storing a reference thereto in the shadow document. Rackman ('646) discloses wherein identifying one of a parent and child document of the received original document and storing a reference thereto in the shadow document. (Figure 4A[ steps 32-36, generating the redacted image]). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Gay ('145) method with the Rackman ('646) in order to create a redundant data archive using the original content so that the document could be retrieved in the event of primary system failing.

Gay ('145) does not explicitly disclose creating a document from an original document received from another communication process; resolving the reference in a document to one of the parent and child document. Srivastava et al ('292) discloses creating a document from an original document received from another communication process (Figure 2 [storing the message] ; resolving the reference in a document to one of the parent and child document (Column 4, lines 52-67, Column 5, lines 1-7 [this system maintains a main copy of a document that is referenced by many users])). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Gay ('145) method with the Srivastava et al ('292) in order to create a redundant data archive using the original content so that the document could be retrieved in the event of primary system failing.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 8, 9 and 17 are allowable over the prior art record.

Claims 19 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3621

***Conclusion***

Examiners note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Winter whose telephone number is (571) 272-6713. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **James Trammell** can be reached at (571) 272-6712.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Washington, D.C. 20231**

or faxed to:

**(703) 305-7687** [Official communications; including After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]

**(703) 308-1396** [Informal/Draft communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the Examiner in the Knox Building, 50 Dulany St. Alexandria, VA.

JMW

May 15, 2005



**JAMES P. TRAMMELL**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600